STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

1. Murphy Hall, 4:30-6:30PM

Tuesday October 24th 2017

**Attendees Present:**

Graduates: Jazz Kiang, Javier Rodriguez, Cody Trojan, & Nicole Ngaosi

Undergraduates: Neemat Abdusemed, Richard White (Chair), Katie Kim, & Christina Wang

Administration: Mike Cohn, Director, SOLE

Barbara Wilson, Director, UCLA Housing & Hospitality

Paolo Velasco, Director of Bruin Resource Center

Faculty: Karen Rowe, Professor

Advisor: Marilyn Alkin, SFAC Advisor (Ex-Officio)

Absent:

1. **Call to Order:**
	1. The meeting was called to order by ***Richard*** at 4:37 p.m.
2. **Approval of Agenda**

A motion was made by ***Nicole*** and seconded by ***Karen*** to approve the agenda. The vote passed unanimously.

1. **Review of Handouts**
	1. ***Richard*** has uploaded all of the documents to Box for live updates during today’s meeting.
2. **Review and Approve Minutes**
	1. ***Richard*** asked if there is a motion to approve the October 10th minutes. ***Cody*** moves to approve the minutes, ***Jazz*** seconds the motion. One abstention, 9 votes to approve.
	2. ***Jazz*** moved to approve the October 17th minutes at the next meeting. ***Nicole*** seconds the motion. The motion passes, and the minutes will be approved next week.
3. **Budget General Information**
	1. ***Rebecca Lee-Garcia*** joins the meeting to discuss the spreadsheet regarding the SFAC Permanent and Temporary Fund requests, and also to review the SFF Unallocated account for the purpose of deciding whether to put a call for permanent funding requests to the campus.
	2. ***Rebecca*** reiterated that the Chancellor’s concern over the amount of time that SFAC spent on requests for small dollar amounts and not enough discussion in the letter on how the unallocated SSF funds could best support student services on campus
		1. ***Karen*** mentioned that this was in response to the details coming to SFAC from the various units requesting funds. ***Rebecca*** mentioned that the letter to the Chancellor was 28 pages, and cautioned brevity. ***Richard*** mentioned that the committee can also send the Executive Summary, and the spreadsheet can be an appendix to the summary. ***Karen*** mentioned that there were discrepancies at the unit level in the requests that came to SFAC, and that this caused the committee to struggle with lack of information. ***Rebecca*** mentioned that she or others can check these forms, double check items, and move the requests to the committee for the approval or rejection. ***Marilyn*** asked how this communication would filter down to the units, and ***Rebecca*** said that she would send a note out to the units, or work through Student Affairs to get the message out. ***Nicole*** pointed out that nipping any challenges in the bud prior to it coming to the committee is valuable, but also asked for a HR policy training for their education, clarification, and professional development. ***Cody*** asked what the intermediary is between the units and the committee, and ***Marilyn*** clarified that the proposals go to the leaderships, such as the EMG group within Student Affairs. ***Paolo*** pointed out that not every unit is from SA; maybe sending out the rates in advance would be helpful, and that the clarity around the minimum wage discussion came after the call letter went out, and he pointed out that not all Directors had that information ahead of time. ***Karen*** mentioned that discussions around permanent funding, and the need for more and clearer information. ***Mike*** noted that this is a very important discussion and point to make, so that units can be more effective in serving students, and as it applies to staff throughout the units. Richard noted that his understanding is that EMG reviews what kind of permanent funding requests prior to the request coming to SFAC. ***Rebecca*** noted that permanent funding is also about annual budgeting for staff via the various units. ***Karen*** noted that there are continuing requests that come to the committee regarding permanent installation, and then there are requests for programs that are newer, and determining funding is difficult due to the lack of data on the program itself—is there a lack of internal review regarding these programs? ***Barbara*** asked if there has been a time when the units ask for less money due to cost saving efforts. ***Rebecca*** mentioned that there may not be that request, due to the student population continuous increases, though there have been select times when permanent funds have been pulled due to a lack of need on campus. ***Cody*** clarified that the committees’ role is to evaluate if these programs support the students, and if it has not continued to do so, then they have the ability to discontinue funding. ***Karen*** noted that last year there was a discussion surrounding ECE, and the questions of its management and organizational structure, which can slow down the discussions around funding requests.
	3. **Discussion around SFAC receiving permanent requests**
		1. **Rebecca** noted that if SFAC puts out a call for permanent funds. There is no need to place a cap today; the determination of how much to give out can be determined later.
			1. Assumption that benefits shortfalls and COLA will be funded. $18.86 million will move into next year. ***Katie*** asked if $2 million is the recommended amount that they can fund, and ***Rebecca*** said that more can be distributed if desired. ***Rebecca*** reiterated that today’s decision is just to give out permanent funds or not. The amount regarding what to give out will be determined based on the requests that come in. ***Mike*** noted that it is worth asking the units why they may have large balances, as the money from student fees should funnel back to student fees. ***Rebecca*** clarified that her office does review this and has pulled money back from some units this year. ***Christina*** asked why the student service fees may continue to rise, if there is money in reserve. ***Paolo*** clarified that due to inflation and operating costs within the units, the SSF funds have risen. ***Paolo*** noted that the committee may also want to consider leaving more funds for future committees to distribute as well. ***Karen*** noted that CAPS received one million dollars last year, and that this may continue to happen as unionizations, etc. happen. ***Nicole*** asked if there have been discussions regarding units that receive state funding, and what the effect of that changing political climate may look like and potentially turn to SSF to cover the shortfall. ***Rebecca*** clarified that the SSF are a significant portion of the Student Affairs budget, but not all of it, and that UCLA has not received additional state funding as well—plans have been made to generate revenue on the Academic Side, as tuition cannot be the only revenue source. ***Richard*** noted that an hour of the meeting remains, and the conversation should continue.
4. **TedX Letter approval**
	1. ***Richard*** asked the committee to review the document for discussion.
		1. **Karen** noted thatcommittee members have noted theirfrustration regarding the means of communication and external sponsorship. ***Richard*** said that Rebecca has communicated that to Residential Life. ***Cody*** moved to adopt the letter as drafted, ***Karen*** seconded. The vote passes with ten yeas.
5. **Parking Permit Letter Approval**
	1. ***Richard*** asked the committee to review the document for discussion.
		1. **Katie** noted thatthis may create a sense of entitlement among students, and monetizes the positions as s student leader, and she questioned allowing students to use their stipends for parking permits. ***Katie*** also noted that this is a good opportunity to research lowering the cost of parking for students across campus, not just for eight student leaders. ***Richard*** noted that there is already a stipend due to being student leaders; the stipends vary, and that discussion will take place later in the year. Stipends were originally to assist with the cost of tuition, and the future discussion regarding this can include the parking cost discussion. ***Javier*** noted that allocation can be an issue, and ***Richard*** noted that the permits are typically for chairs and vice chairs. ***Richard*** noted that the vote did pass, and asked for edits regarding the letter. ***Karen*** noted that this is less of an allocation, and more of a setting aside of funds, such as with CSF. ***Katie*** asked why these committees are given stipends, and not others. ***Richard*** noted that the other committees have requested the stipends, and they are funding bodies. ***Mike*** noted that this is a historical situation. ***Jazz*** noted that the compensation policy has not been looked at since 1994, and this may be the root of the discussion. ***Katie*** asked if the conversation can be delayed until the discussion around stipends and compensation. ***Christina*** asked if they can make this a one-year item, to be discussed later. ***Cody*** noted that this reservation is for students who were not otherwise able to get parking. ***Richard*** noted that the stipends are not advertised when applicants are first applying, and that last year SFAC didn’t know about the parking permits, or the stipends to the other committees. ***Mike*** noted that this already passed, and without a motion to change that, this moved forward, and encouraged the conversation to move forward to allow for further business. ***Nicole*** noted that this is an opportunity for students to worry for one less item as they pay for other items. ***Neemat*** noted that increased stipends could entice more applicants for the positions, and questioned how the stipends are distributed based on who received the permits. ***Christina*** noted that this is still money from student services fees, and she hesitates to use the money for parking fees. ***Jazz*** noted that he is committed to this discussion on the sub-committee, and would feel comfortable if the parking piece was taken care of so that students on leadership positions can participate. ***Karen*** motion to approve and send the letter, ***Javier*** seconds the motion. The vote passes with ten in favor, and one abstention.
6. **Project Review Group Appointments**
	1. {This discussion occurred as an announcement at the end of the meeting.}
7. **Rubric Review and Finalize**
	1. ***Richard*** asked ***Neemat*** to present on the rubric to the committee. They encouraged a lot of room for note taking. ***Richard*** asked the committee to download the document for each department and take notes during the presentations, and asked for electronic notes and files to be kept, rather the multiple printed copies. ***Katie*** moves to approve the document, ***Cody*** seconds the motion. The vote passes with eleven yeas.
		1. Unit presentations begin next week: BruinCorp, BRC and SOLE. ***Richard*** asked for everyone to review the documents over the weekend so that they are ready for the discussions.
8. **Call Letter Development**
	1. **Paolo** asked if a question for sources of future funding will be included in the letter, as well as steps that the unit will take if full funding isn’t received. ***Cody*** raised a question regarding priorities for funding, and ***Richard*** clarified that SFAC’s priorities ensure that their vision for student services are met throughout the units. ***Karen*** asked how the units are meeting new and emerging needs, while some priorities are set by previous committees. ***Nicole*** noted that the units can and do still submit requests of all types, within and without the guidelines of the requests. ***Marilyn*** noted that the priorities are guidelines for the units. ***Jazz*** noted that it is important for units to showcase maximum efficient use of funding, and minimize duplicative ones. ***Cody*** noted that he would like to see notes in funding requests regarding cost saving measure within departments with regard to reducing staff and management and in increasing programs. ***Mike*** noted that many units may be offering similar services, but that students may be comfortable reaching out to certain spaces, and that minimizing duplicative efforts may not be feasible. ***Karen*** brought up that units may do things such as potentially combining events such as welcome events to save costs. ***Mike*** wondered if that would marginalize groups of students in any way. ***Marilyn*** noted that these discussions will be done on a case by case basis at a later date. ***Mike*** asked when the call letter is going out. ***Marilyn*** notes that it will go out prior to Thanksgiving, and be due back to the committee on January 23rd 2018. ***Nicole*** noted that while it is important for the units to put together new and innovative programs, it is also important to seek other sources of funding for the future as well. ***Richard*** asked for all changes to be made to the document.
9. **Announcements**
	1. ***Marilyn*** asked for two appointees for the Project Review Group—one undergraduate and one graduate student to participate and approve a funding request via facilities. ***Neemat*** and ***Javier*** were appointed to PRG.
10. **Adjournment**
	1. ***Mike*** motioned to adjourn the meeting, and ***Neemat*** seconded the meeting. The vote passes and the meeting adjourn at 6:33pm.